

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexandran, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|--------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/010,246 | 12/06/2001 | Robert Sixto JR. | SYN-064C | 5866 | |
| 27316 MAYBACK & | 7590 07/15/2008 & HOFFMAN, P.A. | | EXAMINER | | |
| 5722 S. FLAN | IINGO ROAD #232 | | EREZO, D | EREZO, DARWIN P | |
| FORT LAUDI | ERDALE, FL 33330 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 3773 | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | | | 07/15/2008 | PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|-----------------|--------------|--|--|
| 10/010,246 | SIXTO ET AL. | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | | |
| Darwin P. Erezo | 3773 | | |

| | Daiwiii F. E1e20 | 3113 | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the | correspondence add | ress | | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 30 June 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. | | | | | | | | |
| ☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evident, e, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 3 r CFR 1, 17 (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 3 r CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: | | | | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing | date of the final rejection. | | | | | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (| iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing | date of the final rejection | n. | | | | | |
| MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(|). | | | | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL. | ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat | of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic | ite extension fee e action; or (2) as | | | | | |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp | liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be | filed within two months | of the date of | | | | | |
| filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). | | | | | | | | |
| AMENDMENTS | | | | | | | | |
| The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t | | | cause | | | | | |
| (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor | | E below); | | | | | | |
| (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below | | de calana a a almantificiana si | a lanuar for | | | | | |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in beti appeal; and/or | ter form for appeal by materially re- | auding or simplifying ti | ie issues ioi | | | | | |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c | corresponding number of finally reig | ected claims | | | | | | |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | | | | | | | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 | 21 See attached Notice of Non-Co | mnliant Amendment (| PTOL-324) | | | | | |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | inpliant / information (i | TOL OL+). | | | | | |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). | | imely filed amendmer | t canceling the | | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) rejected: | | I be entered and an ex | planation of | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea | al and/or appellant fails | s to provide a | | | | | |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | n of the status of the claims after e | ntry is below or attache | ed. | | | | | |
| The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> | | condition for allowand | ce because: | | | | | |
| 12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. ☐ Other: | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | /Darwin P. Erezo/ Primary Examiner, Art U | nit 3773 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the applicant's arguments are not persuasive. The applicant's main argument is directed towards the Nakso reference failing to teach a surgical clip having a first arm and a second arm substantially parallel to the first arm. However, as stated in the Final rejection, Nakso discloses a deployed state (or a clip in use) wherein the clip has first and second arms that are substantially parallel. It is noted that the claims do not clearly state that the first arm and the second arm remain substantially parallel as the retainer is deformed, or the first arm and second being substantially parallel prior to deployment. The broadest reasonable interpretation for the claims merely require the clip having a parallel arms at one point in time. In this case, Nakso has parallel arms, as seen in Fig. 10.